

1
2
3
4
5
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8

9 SIEU PHONG NGO,) No. C 08-0620 JSW (PR)
10 Petitioner,)
11 vs.) **ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**
12 BEN CURRY, Warden,)
13 Respondent.)
14 _____)

15 **INTRODUCTION**
16

17 Petitioner, a prisoner of the State of California, currently incarcerated at
18 Correctional Training Facility in Soledad, California, has filed a habeas corpus petition
19 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 challenging the decision by the California Board of Parole
20 Hearings (“Board”) to deny Petitioner parole. Petitioner has paid the filing fee. This
21 order directs Respondent to show cause why the petition should not be granted.
22

23 **BACKGROUND**
24

25 According to the petition, Petitioner was convicted of second degree murder in
26 Orange County Superior Court, and, on October 21, 1993, the trial court sentenced him to
27 a term of 15 years-to-life in state prison plus one year. In 2006, the Board found
28 Petitioner unsuitable for parole. Petitioner challenged this decision unsuccessfully in all
three levels of the California courts, and thereafter filed the instant petition for a writ of
habeas corpus.
28

DISCUSSION

I Standard of Review

This court may entertain a petition for a writ of habeas corpus “in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a).

It shall “award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted, unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto.” *Id.* § 2243.

II Legal Claims

Petitioner alleges that the Board's decision violated his right to due process because it was not supported by some evidence and it solely relied on Petitioner's commitment offense. Liberally construed, the allegations are sufficient to warrant a response from Respondent. *See Board of Pardons v. Allen*, 482 U.S. 369 (1987); *see, e.g., Morales. v. California Dep't of Corrections*, 16 F.3d 1001, 1005 (9th Cir. 1994), *rev'd on other grounds*, 514 U.S. 499 (1995).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and for good cause shown,

1. The Clerk shall serve by certified mail a copy of this order and the petition, and all attachments thereto, on Respondent and Respondent's attorney, the Attorney General of the State of California. The Clerk also shall serve a copy of this order on Petitioner.

2. Respondent shall file with the Court and serve on Petitioner, within **sixty (60)** days of the issuance of this order, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be granted. Respondent shall file with the answer and serve on Petitioner a copy of all portions of the state trial record that have been transcribed previously and that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition. If Petitioner wishes to respond

1 to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse with the Court and serving it on
2 Respondent within **thirty (30)** days of his receipt of the answer.

3 3. Respondent may file a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds in lieu of an
4 answer, as set forth in the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing
5 Section 2254 Cases. If Respondent files such a motion, Petitioner shall file with the Court
6 and serve on Respondent an opposition or statement of non-opposition within **thirty (30)**
7 days of receipt of the motion, and Respondent shall file with the Court and serve on
8 Petitioner a reply within **fifteen (15)** days of receipt of any opposition.

9 4. It is Petitioner's responsibility to prosecute this case. Petitioner must keep
10 the Court informed of any change of address by filing a separate paper captioned "Notice
11 of Change of Address." He must comply with the Court's orders in a timely fashion.
12 Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant
13 to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 DATED: May 6, 2008


16 JEFFREY S. WHITE
17 United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SIEU PHONG NGO,

Case Number: CV08-00620 JSW

Plaintiff,

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

V.

BEN CURRY et al,

Defendant.

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on May 6, 2008, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

Sieu Phong Ngo J-07024
Correctional Training Facility
P.O. Box 689
B-319U
Soledad, CA 93960-0689

Dated: May 6, 2008

Jennifer Ottolini

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
By: Jennifer Ottolini, Deputy Clerk